

**REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 26, and 27 are currently amended, claims 3, 6, 11, 13-25, and 29 are cancelled, and claims 2, 7, 8, 10, 12, and 28 remain original and unamended. No new claims have been added, hence claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, and 26-28 remain currently pending.

1. Response to Objections to the Specification and Claims

The Office Action states that the disclosure and claims are objected to because the term “voice recognition” is misused for what nowadays is called speech recognition, in the speech signal processing art. Applicant respectfully traverses this objection on the ground that the claims recite a voice recognizer configured to recognize a user’s voice and transform an expression input by the user. The specification of the application states that the voice recognizer transforms an expression received from a person into a different mode of information, and that the recognizer is trained to recognize the person’s voice. ( Specification, page 3, paragraphs 10 and 11). The expression spoken words or phrases. Thus, the claims and the specification clearly use the term voice recognizer to mean a unit that identifies both what is being said as well as who is doing the speaking. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that the claimed term “voice recognizer” is adequately defined in the specification and used consistently in the claims in accordance with this definition.

2. Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 CFR § 1.75(c)

Claims 13 and 16 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 (c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. By this amendment, claims 13 and 16 have been cancelled, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the instant rejection of these claims under 37 CFR 1.75(c) is rendered moot.

3. Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 102

Claims 1, 2, 15, 16, 18-21, and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sasai et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,510,412). The Office Action states that with regard to claim 1, Sasai teaches a handheld personal device comprising: a speech recognizer configured to transform an expression from a person into a different mode of information, a natural-language processor configured to process the mode of information to extract, from a database, a piece of information that is personal to the person, and the processor can still extract the piece of information when the person declares the expression differently.

By this amendment, claim 1 has been amended to recite: a handheld personal assistant operated by a user comprising: a categorizer configured to store a plurality of data items in a database organized by one or more categories of information; a voice-recognizer configured to recognize the user's voice and transform an expression input by the user into a different mode of information; a context processor configured determine the category of information corresponding to the expression input by the user based on one of a direct context specified by the user or an inferred context based on the expression input; and a natural-language processor configured to process the mode of information to extract, from the database, a piece of information that is

personal to the user, wherein upon recognition of the user's voice, the personal assistant only allows the user to access the piece of information that is personal to the user.

Sasai describes a system for extracting data from a private information storage unit using a concept extraction unit and an intention interpretation unit. As stated in the Office Action, Sasai does not teach "only allowing access to the information personal to the person based on the person's voice." (Office Action, 9/22/04, page 7). Claim 1 has been amended to recite a handheld personal assistant that includes a voice-recognizer configured to recognize the user's voice and transform an expression to extract a piece of information that is personal to the user, wherein upon recognition of the user's voice, the personal assistant only allows the user to access the piece of information that is personal to the user. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that, in light of the amendment, claim 1 is not rendered unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of the cited reference.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and therefore, for the reasons provided above with respect to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is not anticipated by Sasai.

Claims 3, 15, 16, and 18-21 have been cancelled, therefore, it is submitted that the instant rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been rendered moot.

Claims 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by Alpdemir (U.S. Pat. 6,658,389). By this amendment, claims 24 and 25 have been cancelled. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the instant rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been rendered moot.

Claim 26 is an independent method claim that has been amended to include elements similar to those in amended claim 1. Therefore, for the reasons provided above with respect to

claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the instant rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in light of Sasai has been overcome.

Claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 26, and therefore, for the reasons provided above with respect to claim 26, it is respectfully submitted that these are not anticipated by Sasai.

Claim 29 has been cancelled, therefore, it is submitted that the instant rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been rendered moot.

3. Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 3-14, 17, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasai in view of Alpdemir.

By this amendment, 3, 6, 11, 13, 14, 17, 22, and 23 have been cancelled. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the instant rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been rendered moot.

Claims 4, 5, 7-10, and 12 depend from claim 1, which has been amended to recite a handheld personal assistant that comprises a categorizer configured to store a plurality of data items in a database organized by one or more categories of information, a voice-recognizer configured to recognize the user's voice and transform an expression input by the user into a different mode of information, and a context processor configured determine the category of information corresponding to the expression input by the user based on one of a direct context specified by the user or an inferred context based on the expression input.

Neither Sasai nor Alpdemir, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest a handheld personal assistant that stores data items in a database organized into categories, or determines the

category of information corresponding to an input expression based on either a direct context specified by the user or an inferred context. As stated in the Office Action, “Sasai does not teach the piece of information depends on the context under which the person made the expression,” (Office Action, 9/22/04, page 9) and Alpdemir does not add any teaching that would render the elements of this claim obvious.

Alpdemir describes a system in which consumers call in to a service, make requests in plain speech for information on goods or services, and the service responds to the request in real time. The system includes a database that stores a plurality of data items and a search engine that searches the database for a particular item in response to a text converted speech request. Alpdemir does not teach a system that that stores data items in a database organized into categories, or determines the category of information corresponding to an input expression based on either a direct context specified by the user or an inferred context, as claimed in amended claim 1 and its dependant claims. In Alpdemir, a consumer selects from a menu selection and responds to the commands associated with the menu selection. The cited instant of the caller responding by saying “more” (Alpdemir, Col. 9, lines 54-56) does not represent a retrieval of information based on the context under which the user made the expression. Instead, the selection of “more” is a command prompted by the system to offer further menu selections. In contrast, claim 1 recites the storage of information items based on categories and the retrieval of information from the appropriate storage category based on the context in which the request was made. Furthermore, the context can be inferred from the expression, or it can be directly specified by the user. Such a mechanism is not taught or suggested by Alpdemir. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4, 5, 7-10, and 12, which depend from amended claim 1 are not rendered unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in light of the cited combination.

Furthermore, with respect to claims 9 and 10, neither Sasai nor Alpdemir teach or suggest a handheld personal assistant that includes a formatting process that transforms the expression input by the user into a question with one or more phrases corresponding to the one or more categories of information, and a transformation process that converts the question into an instruction comprising a query to the database. Therefore, for this additional reason, it is respectfully submitted that amended claims 9 and 10 are not rendered obvious by the cited combination.

Applicant respectfully requests that the above described amendments be made part of the official record in the present application, and respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments and is present in the specification, claims, and drawings as originally filed, and that no new matter has been added.


If there are any shortages, the Examiner is authorized to charge our Deposit Account Number 04-0822.

Respectfully submitted,

DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP

Dated: January 24, 2005

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Geoffrey T. Staniford  
Reg. No.: 43,151